

is wrong when the Bosnian Muslims do it. The question is by inserting ourselves can we stop this? Is this the most effective way? And will we accidentally create a problem potentially bigger than the problem that we went in to solve?

Secondly, this is not about refugee aid. We should be having a separate vote on refugee aid, not refugee aid serving as a cover for military appropriations for a continuing war. All of us agree that the economies of Albania and Macedonia have been devastated by being unable to continue their trade not only with Serbia but the other countries around them, by handling the refugees that come in, by having a general collapse of their economies by their openness. We need to give aid for the refugees, we need to give aid to those countries. That is not what this supplemental appropriations bill is about next week. That is merely wrapping with it. We will give refugee aid, we will give aid to those countries, but I believe it should happen after we have a settlement there.

Thirdly, this is not about replacing military preparedness. This President has already proven that whatever we appropriate, he diverts to the war. We can appropriate it for this or that, but if he wants to continue the war, he is diverting it. We have an obligation if we say we are against this war not to hide behind what we are replacing but understand he has no conscience as far as how he will divert the money, which also leads me to, this is not about military buildup. I am one of those who believes we are at least \$20 billion behind in military preparedness and that is why we need to do it and that is why we must as a Republican Congress step up regardless of the budget question and address the defense question. But not here. If we put \$12 billion, \$6 billion more than he proposed on this bill, what assurances do we have that this is not either going to continue the war or be used, even worse, for the ground war that we voted against last night? Because there are no fire walls that you can put in, particularly if we continue to allow reprogramming of money in our leadership that protects us from having voted the funds next week to go to a ground war.

It is fine to stand up here as we did last night and say we are against a ground war, we are against continuing this air war, we are against a declaration of war, but the real thing comes down to the money. Next week are we going to stand up and say, "He can't have the money to continue and expand this war. We want to see people come to the table in a livable, workable thing?"

When I was at NATO in Brussels, I had a very weird feeling as I was sitting around the table and hearing how we cannot back up, this could be terrible and devastating for NATO. This is so much like Vietnam where we heard all those things and in fact we got the same deal after we had the loss of

American lives that we could have had the first day.

In a very interesting book, "Taking Charge" by Michael Beschloss about Lyndon Johnson, actual tapes, this is an exchange of Lyndon Johnson with Dick Russell, head of the Senate Foreign Relations, I believe, at that time.

"LBJ: I spend all my days with Rusk and McNamara and Bundy and Hariman and Vance and all those folks that are dealing with it and I would say it pretty well adds up to them now that we've got to show some power and some force—that they do not believe—they don't believe that the Chinese Communists will come into this thing. But they don't know and nobody can really be sure. But their feeling is that they won't. And in any event, that we haven't got much choice, that we are treaty-bound, that we are there, that there will be a domino that will kick off a whole list of others, that we've got to prepare for the worst."

That is exactly what we are being told here. That is exactly what I heard at NATO. "Oh, we can't back up because we are treaty-bound, we are there, it will be a domino."

In fact, we stayed in Vietnam. We lost many of my friends, thousands of Americans in that battle, and in the end wound up backing up, because the problem here is do not bluff, do not make threats that you cannot follow through. Our generals have told us, this is unwinnable in the air. Those of us who have been over there, those of us who have studied any history realize you cannot do a ground war from the south. A ground war would have to come from the north. Not only are there huge mountains and not only have armies throughout world history been stopped in those mountains, you have to come from the north.

If you come from the north you have Romania and Hungary drawn into the war. You have a problem of coming through Belgrade and northern Yugoslavia and then us owning northern Yugoslavia as well as the autonomous republic of Kosovo.

It is not winnable on the ground. The American people need to be told that if we go to a ground war, between 20 and 50,000 Americans are going to lose their lives. We have to understand what we are faced with here. We bluffed. We should not bluff when we do not have the ability to execute. It is time to cut off the funding for this war.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS IN GUAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is the third time in 3 weeks that I have taken the opportunity to give a special order on an ongoing crisis in my home island of Guam, and this pertains to the continuing arrival of illegal immigrants from the People's Republic of China.

During this past week, there was yet another 200, over 200 illegal immigrants who have arrived. On October 23, 175 were apprehended off of Guam's waters and on April 28 another estimated 100 were apprehended near Guam's shores by the U.S. Coast Guard.

□ 1345

The number of apprehended illegal immigrants from the People's Republic caught near Guam is now well over 700 this year. A couple of weeks ago I informed this body and I have informed the administration about the inhuman ramifications of this smuggling trade in human beings into Guam.

These people are being smuggled in by Chinese crime syndicates which charge them anywhere from \$10,000 to \$30,000 each. They set sail in squalid quarters meant to survive, in a vessel that is meant to survive a one-way trip in open ocean for over 10 days from the Fukien Province inside China to Guam, near Guam, and the Mariana Islands.

Upon successfully completing the trip, they are then, if they are successful and if they land on Guam, invariably they are successful in getting some kind of asylum, they are made into indentured servants for many years to work to pay off their debt to the smugglers who have brought them into the United States.

This is very unlike other economic refugees or even the border crossings that we see on our southern border. This is clearly a smuggling trade in which these people who are making the journey are as much victims as the people of Guam are being victimized by this trade.

According to the INS officer in charge on Guam, Mr. David Johnston, the waves of illegal immigrants will not stop. We are faced with a phenomenon that will not stop unless we change the applicability of Federal law to Guam, in the case of immigration, the application of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, and unless we make it apparent to the Chinese smuggling crime syndicates that this will no longer be a profitable trade for them.

There is a way out which has been utilized by the administration, a process which I fully endorse, and that is to take these people and instead of moving them to Guam, to take them up to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, another U.S. territory, but interestingly a U.S. territory in which the application of the Immigration and Naturalization Act does not fully apply.

So what that means is that when these people are taken to the Northern Marianas, what happens is that they do not have the right to all the kinds of asylum which is generally available in Guam or any other U.S. territory. It is anticipated that from there they can be repatriated back to China within weeks rather than the 2 years it takes to adjudicate asylee cases, in which case most of the time they are generally released into American society.

So as a consequence of this the Coast Guard has been taking and trying to interdict these vessels in the open ocean and moving them to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands through the collaboration and cooperation of Governor Tenorio and other officials there, and for that at least the people of Guam are grateful, and we certainly endorse this policy, this practice which has been implemented by the Clinton administration.

Illegal immigration into the United States is a Federal responsibility. Because of Guam's proximity to Asia, it is incumbent that Federal agencies assist the Government of Guam in combating this serious problem on our shores. It is important to understand that Guam is only 212 square miles in size and our population is only 150,000. Any significant increase in the immigrant population on the island has significant social and financial repercussions because of our financial, current financial conditions which are affected by the Asian economic crisis, and because we do not have the alternative resources available for noncriminal alien immigrants that are generally available in the U.S. mainland.

The financial strain on Guam's resources are tremendous. I hope that we can find a way to reprogram some \$10 to \$15 million to take care of this problem on Guam and to reimburse the Government of Guam for costs that have already been expended on this crisis.

A PEACEFUL RESOLUTION TO THE SITUATION IN THE BALKANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I hope we are all here well informed of the efforts of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), to bring about a peaceful solution to the situation in the Balkans. In the light of yesterday's votes on the Balkans, I believe this effort should be immediately embraced by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am astounded that the administration choose not to support the attempts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) at finding a peaceful solution to the crisis in Kosovo. The decision by the administration leads me to reluctantly conclude that they are determined to prosecute a war in Kosovo regardless of costs. The attempt by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) in coordination with the Russian Duma should have been wholeheartedly embraced by this administration as a means to ensure the safety of not only the Kosovars, but our men and women in uniform carrying out the NATO mission. I can think of no reason why the administration would reject the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the members of the

Russian Duma. The agreement, if successful, would establish a cease-fire under conditions first proposed by the NATO countries.

Now, if the NATO requirements were dismissed in the proposal and unsatisfactory ones drafted, I could understand that the administration would be unable or unwilling to support it. But a rejection of a potential agreement with the NATO conditions as a prerequisite is unimaginable.

It is essential for this Congress to accept its responsibility to our men and women in uniform and ensure that their safety is the paramount concern of the United States. Unfortunately, with the administration's rejection of the potential peace initiative I cannot be sure that it is theirs.

The United States does not have a vital interest in the Balkans. We have not been presented with clear objectives, any specific mission or even a coherent exit strategy. Now the administration is choosing military action over peace.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to support the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) in the Balkans.

THE HIGH TECH ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the fastest growing segment of our economy has been the high tech segment of our economy driven mostly by computers, software, the Internet, biotech, and also the products that our increasing technology enables us to create. It is what has been most responsible for the strong economy we have enjoyed in the last 7 or 8 years and, more importantly, will be the cornerstone of what the future is going to hold. The more we can do to move the high tech economy forward, the more jobs that we could create and the stronger an economy that we can have.

Now we deal with a lot of complicated issues in Congress. Mostly our goal is to try to improve the lives of the people we represent. There are a lot of very strong difficulties in doing that, but the one thing that most clearly, positively affects the lives of the people all of us represent is a strong economy. That is means opportunity, opportunity for good jobs and a decent wage so that you can take care of your family and build for the future. High tech is critical to that.

That is the first component of what I want to talk about, the high tech economy. The second component is exports and basically creating markets for our goods, specifically for our high tech goods. Ninety-six percent of the people in the world live someplace other than the United States of America.

Now in the U.S. we still manage to consume 20 percent of the world's goods, services and products, so what

that means is if we are going to have growth in any aspect of our economy really, not just the high tech aspect, we are going to have to look overseas. We are going to have to look to that other 96 percent of the world out there and increase their consumption of our goods.

Bottom line: Increase exports, and in particular, increase exports of high tech products. Those are the two things that need to come together, the importance of getting at that 96 percent of the rest of the world and the importance of continuing to allow our high tech economy to thrive. If that high tech economy is going to thrive, we are going to have to get access to those other markets. Our companies in this country are going to have to get access to those other markets for one central reason, that we are the leaders in most aspects of the high tech economy.

We are far from alone. Countries throughout the world are developing their own Internet technology, their own telecommunications technology, their own software and hardware technology. We have competitors out there, and if they have access to markets that we do not have access to, that is inevitably going to catch up with us. It is going to give them the ability to grow and prosper and then feed more money back into research and development to develop the next best product, and in the high tech community, as my colleagues know, today's best product could be just totally out the window tomorrow as technology leaps ahead. You have to be the one in the position to leap ahead, and to get there we have to give our high tech products access to those foreign markets, and we are failing in three areas right at the moment.

Number one, we have too many broad based economic sanctions that are unilaterally imposed by our country. We unilaterally decide that our country's companies will not be allowed to do business with dozens of other countries for dozens of other reasons. This does not work because while we make that unilateral decision, our competitors do not. Our competitors sell products to those same countries, so we do not have any impact on the country that we are trying to impact except to force them to buy good goods from our competitors.

But two other areas are specifically problematic for the high tech community. One is encryption software, and skipping a complicated analysis, encryption software is basically the software that enables you to protect whatever is on your computer, to make sure that only you can see it and no one else can. This is very important for a variety of reasons, privacy reasons but also competitive reasons.

Any computer technology, computer product, software product that is sold requires top-of-the-line encryption technology, but our country does not allow our companies to export top-of-